



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

the hieroglyph and the cuneiform appear to favor the Jewish record. "My historical criticism," says Ebers, "is the more full of devotion as every day of study leads me into deeper reverence for those wonderful books." Rawlinson declared in 1877 that he had found no difficulty in accepting the literal sense of the Mosaic narratives from any evidence of the monuments.

We mention a few minor points in which the agreement is striking. Pharaoh gave to Abraham sheep but not horses. Contemporary monuments represent sheep, while horses do not appear until after the Hyksos invasion.

In the many details of the life of Joseph nothing occurs, says Ebers, "that would not agree exactly with court life of the Pharaohs in the time of their glory."—The Harris papyrus thus refers to the Exodus: "The population of Egypt had broken away over the borders, and among those who remained there was no commanding voice." The Bible says Hezekiah paid Sennacherib 30 talents of gold and 300 talents of silver which is the more strikingly confirmed by the apparent discrepancy of the Assyrian record, which contains 800 talents of silver. But as Schrader says, the agreement is exact, as three Palestinian silver talents were equal to eight Assyrian.

The length of the reign of Nebuchadnezzar, 43 years, is confirmed by the clay tablets. His madness, when he ate grass as an ox, seems to be referred to by the record made after his recovery: "For four years I did not build high places; I did not lay up treasures; I did not sing the praises of Merodach; I did not offer sacrifice; I did not clear out the canals."

Belshazzar, the last king of Babylon, whose existence was long doubted, has been found as Bilshuruzur. Ahasuerus has been identified as Xerxes, and his presence at Susa in the third year of his reign and again in the seventh, when Esther was made queen, coincides with the date of his return from his invasion of Greece.

14 nations, 14 kings, 40 cities, and 10 idols named in Scripture occur in their proper place and time on the monuments. Such numerous and minute points of historical contact are now flung like a net over Scripture books and dates, and will hold them in their places in spite of all the herculean efforts of those who would displace or rearrange them.

➤BOOK NOTICES.◀

LAGARDE'S SEPTUAGINT.*

It has long been known that Paul de Lagarde of Göttingen was at work upon the text of the Septuagint. At different times he has published contributions to the solution of this difficult problem.† Two years ago he announced the long ex-

* *LIBRORUM VETERIS TESTAMENTI CANONICORUM*. Pars Prior, Graece. Pauli de Lagarde, edita. Gottingæ: A. Hoyer, 1883. XVI, 544 pp.

† It is worth while to give the list of these contributions here: *Veteris Testamenti ab Origene recensiti fragmenta apud Syros servata quinque* (1879), *Materialien zur Geschichte und Kritik des Pentateuchs* (1867), *Psalterium, Job, Proverbia arabice* (1876), *Der Pentateuch Koptisch* (1867), *Psalterii versio memphitica* (1875), *Anmerkung zur griechischen Uebersetzung der Proverbien* (1863), *Genesis graece* (1868), *Die Pariser Blaetter des Codex Samaritanus* (1879). Bearing more directly upon the Hebrew are *Hieronymi quaestiones hebraicae in libro Geneseos* (1868), *Prophetæ chaldaice* (1872), *Hagiographa chaldaice* (1874), and *Psalterium juxta Hebraeos Hieronymi* (1874).

pected work in a separate pamphlet* which proved a disappointment in some respects—in others it was interesting if not edifying. This pamphlet really announced the abandonment of the attempt to give us a “final” edition of the Septuagint. It gave the reasons at some length and the impartial reader could not deny their weight. At the same time the author announced *an* edition if not *the* edition of his text, and this has now appeared. If a disappointment it is not so externally. It is a large octavo well printed on good paper and decidedly a handsome volume. It contains the books from Genesis to Esther in the order in which they are usually found in the Greek—the same as in our own version.

But the external appearance is only secondary in a book of this kind and we turn at once to the text to discover wherein this edition differs from those which have preceded it. And here we discover that former printed editions are based upon one or another of the great uncial manuscripts. The source of the Complutensian Polyglot is not yet definitely ascertained. Grabe followed mainly the Alexandrine Codex. The Roman edition (which is copied closely by Tischendorf) reproduces the Vatican manuscript, which contains a New Testament text of acknowledged superiority. But the uncials are not the only sources at our command for the Septuagint. There are many cursive manuscripts; and the derived versions are of considerable if not equal importance. How shall we deal with this mass of matter? The natural answer at first sight seems to be—make up a text from the best manuscripts and disregard the others. This would mean to make up a text from the uncials especially ABS (or **N**).

But a little reflection shows the objections to such a course. In the first place although this group of MSS. is older than any other actually existing, its members are yet three centuries further away from the autograph than in the case of the New Testament. The greater age is less distinctly an advantage. In the second place it seems not impossible that these great uncials which are of about the same date and which resemble each other closely in many ways may present a single type of text. They may be derived, that is, from a single original of not much greater age than themselves. In such a case their coincidence would be authority only for the reading of their immediate ancestor, which might be good, bad, or indifferent.

The question of superiority then is not so easily decided by simply comparing the age of existing copies. The internal probability of readings must first be tested. In order to this we must bring to view the whole mass of material. First however it will be well to eliminate as many variants as possible by the genealogical method. What that method undertakes is very clearly set forth by Westcott and Hort in the second volume of their Greek Testament. The application of it by Lagarde is instructive enough to consider a little.

The first thing he noticed was that certain MSS. (all cursives, it is not necessary to describe them here) agreed in a number of cases where they all differed from others; or to put it differently, that they were constant in agreement among themselves—but irregular as to others. This fact established their affinity—which means of course that they were all copied (or descended) from a single prototype. By the ordinary rules of comparison they will restore to us this prototype. In the process of restoration all the cases in which they differ will have been considered and their variations may henceforth be disregarded and the mass of unruly material will have been diminished by so much.

* Ankuendigung einer neuen Ausgabe der griech. Uebersetzung des Alten Testaments (1882).

Lagarde's edition is simply the restoration of this lost original—it gives us a new MS. and allows us to lay aside the six from which it is derived. The question comes, however,—what sort of a MS. was this of which we now have a copy? The first answer is—it was certainly an uncial and therefore of considerable age. This is shown by the variations of the derived MSS. among themselves, e. g. one has *ειδονα* for *Σιδωνα*; *Βααλερμων* is written *Βαλαερμων*; *Χαλααμα* becomes *Χααλαμα*, *Μααιναν* *Μαλιναν*. These are evidently mistakes in copying an uncial text and a long list of similar ones is given in the preface.

The second fact discoverable is that this early MS. contains a very different text from that given by the uncial group. It differs more widely from all of them than they do from each other. To show this would take more space than is proper to a simple book notice, but it can be shown conclusively. Lagarde himself gives the outline of a demonstration in his preface. This does not prove, of course, that the new text is better than the others—which is the better we are yet to find out. All it shows is that we are in possession of a text which has escaped to a large degree the influences which have affected the group ABS—or on the other hand that we now have a text which has been affected by influences which they have escaped. In either case it is desirable that we should have both forms in order to comparison.

A third fact is discovered by Lagarde and the outline demonstration is given in the preface. It is that a text closely conformed to the one before us was in the hands of Chrysostom and he quoted copiously from it in his homilies—not from the recension represented by the uncials.

Fourthly, the meagre fragments of the Gothic version of Ulfilas (made at Constantinople or at least under Constantinopolitan influence) seem to represent this text and not that of the other group.

The combination of these facts with an assertion of Jerome (made more than once) is easily made. Jerome, namely, says that three recensions of the Septuagint were current in his time. The Antiochian made by Lucian, the Alexandrian made under the supervision of Hesychius and the Palestinian which was circulated after Origen's labors by Eusebius and Pamphilus. The Antiochian was current in Constantinople and Asia Minor and would naturally be in the hands of Chrysostom. Lagarde therefore claims (not without reason) that his edition restores for us the text of Lucian. The uncial group, if it is purely of either of the others, is probably (?) Palestinian, as Origen's reputation gave that large currency in the East (this is not Lagarde's conclusion; he expresses no opinion at all about this group).

A somewhat extended comparison of this edition with that of Tischendorf authorizes the assertion that it is generally further removed from the Hebrew (as we now have it). This would argue for its nearness to the original Septuagint. On the other hand there are numerous instances in which this has been corrected by the Massoretic text and the other has been left unchanged.

Enough has been said to show the value of this work, and the difficulty of the problem it attacks. It is to be hoped that the editor will be disappointed in his gloomy forebodings as to the sale of the work. No theological library should be without it, and those who are disposed to examine in earnest [the text of the Septuagint will find it indispensable. We commend it also to those who desire a copy of the Septuagint for study. This text is certainly as good as any other and it is better printed than the most.

H. P. SMITH.